

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).  
Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50.  
Address all communications to J. Macmillan & Co., Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City.  
Entered as second-class matter, No. 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXI, No. 25

MONDAY, MAY 7, 1928

WHOLE No. 582



ESSEDUM BRITANNICUM

## The Art of Reading Latin

What better way to cultivate the art of reading Latin easily and well than to start early and keep it up while learning grammar and syntax? Why wait until all the rules are mastered? Just as soon as the first declension and the first conjugation are learned, simple stories can be read which will enlarge the vocabulary and encourage a feeling of reality in Latin as a living rather than a dead language.

## The ELEMENTARY LATIN CLASSICS

*offer eight readers of increasing difficulty for the first two years of Latin*

Sonnenschein: ORA MARITIMA

Reed: JULIA  
CAMILLA

Morton: LEGENDS OF GODS AND HEROES

Nall: THE SEVEN KINGS OF ROME

Caesar's HELVETIAN WAR

Caesar's INVASION OF BRITAIN

Wilkinson: LEGENDS OF ANCIENT ROME

*All are illustrated. The above illustration is from ORA MARITIMA*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

## GREEK DICTIONARIES

<b>Autenrieth's Homeric Dictionary</b>	
312 pages, illustrated .....	\$1.40
<b>Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon</b>	
1794 pages .....	\$10.00
<b>Liddell and Scott's Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon</b>	
912 pages .....	\$5.00
<b>Liddell and Scott's Abridged Greek-English Lexicon</b>	
832 pages .....	\$3.00
<b>Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</b>	
747 pages .....	\$6.00
<b>Yonge's English-Greek Lexicon</b>	
893 pages .....	\$6.00
<b>Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities</b>	
1716 pages, 1500 illustrations .....	\$8.00

## AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

## Columbia University in the City of New York

### SUMMER SESSION

July 9 to August 17, 1928

Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., and various diplomas of Teachers College.

#### GREEK

<b>Elementary Course</b>	(= Entrance Greek a) Professor Eugene Tavenner	<b>Herodotus</b>	Professor Clinton W. Keyes
<b>Xenophon</b>	(= Entrance Greek b) Professor Eugene Tavenner	<b>Tragedy</b>	Professor La Rue Van Hook
		<b>Greek Life and Thought</b>	Professor La Rue Van Hook

#### LATIN

<b>Elementary Course</b>	(For Beginners) Mr. Irving C. Demarest	<b>Odes of Horace</b>	(College Course) Mr. Moses Hadas
<b>Caesar, Gallic War</b>	(= Entrance Latin 3) Professor Clinton W. Keyes	<b>Prose Composition</b>	(Advanced College Course) Mr. Moses Hadas
<b>Vergil, Aeneid</b>	(= Entrance Latin 5) Mr. Irving C. Demarest	<b>Roman Literature of the Early Empire</b>	Professor Marbury B. Ogle
<b>Cicero: Selected Orations</b>	(= Entrance Latin 4) Mr. Paul R. Hays	<b>Vergil, Aeneid</b>	(Advanced Course) Professor Nelson G. McCrea
<b>Prose Composition</b>	(= Entrance Latin 6) Mr. Paul R. Hays	<b>Roman Lyric and Elegiac Poetry</b>	Professor Marbury B. Ogle
<b>Prose Composition</b>	(For Teachers) Professor Hubert M. Poter	<b>Roman Philosophy</b>	Professor Hubert M. Poter
<b>Livy</b>	(College Course) Professor Frank H. Cowles	<b>Prose Composition</b>	(For the A.M. degree) Professor Nelson G. McCrea
		<b>Roman World of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil</b>	Professor Frank H. Cowles

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

<b>Ancient History</b>	Professor Herbert C. Holdridge	<b>Roman Empire</b>	Professor Albert T. Olmstead
------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------

#### PUBLIC LECTURES ON GREEK AND LATIN SUBJECTS

For Announcement of the 1928 Summer Session, Address the Secretary of  
Columbia University, New York City

# The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXI, No. 25

MONDAY, MAY 7, 1928

WHOLE No. 582

## HORACE, CARMINA 1.2.13-16 AGAIN THE EFFECT OF WIND ON WATER LEVELS

In *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 19.83-84, in discussing the interpretation of Horace, *Carmina* 1.2.13-16, I had something to say about the effect of the wind in raising or lowering the level of stretches of water, in bays or in rivers. The paper was called forth by the supercilious way in which a modern editor of Horace had disposed of a passage in Seneca, a passage cited by other editors in explanation of Horace, *Carmina* 1.2.13-16. My remarks called forth comments by Mr. J. F. Gummere, Dr. B. W. Mitchell, Professor A. S. Pease, and Professor G. M. Bolling, which I grouped in a brief paper in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 19.126.

In the intervening period, some more material bearing on the theme has been brought to my attention.

Particularly helpful is a clipping from *The Ann Arbor Times News*, of November 16, 1926, which Dr. Eugene S. McCartney was good enough to send to me. It gives a brief article, entitled *Lake Levels and Gales*, by Dr. Charles F. Brooks, of Clark University.

A strong wind blowing across a large lake tends to raise the level of the water along the shore towards which it blows and to lower it on the opposite shore. This piling up of water by a general wind is well shown in simultaneous observations at Buffalo harbor and Amherstburg, Ont.—stations at opposite ends of Lake Erie.

When a storm is approaching, northeast winds cause the water to fall at Buffalo and rise at Amherstburg. As the storm passes and the wind shifts to the southwest, the water levels also shift; now the water rises at Buffalo and falls at Amherstburg. About midway between, however, the level remains constant.

Convergence of shore lines at Buffalo favors the heaping up of water in that harbor and sometimes endangers docks and wharves. On the other hand, low water makes trouble by causing groundings on the shoals at either end of the lake. A northwest wind blows across the lake and causes an oscillation between the Canadian and American shores rather than between the ends of the lake.

During gales numerous strong currents are set up, which are an all too frequent cause of shipwreck. These currents are not always the same for winds of the same direction, for the distribution of atmosphere pressure as well as the wind is a factor in the levels of different parts of a lake and, therefore, in the currents produced. Rarely do two storms have approximately the same pressures and winds.

Dr. McCartney tells me, also, that there is interesting material bearing on our theme in Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.26, at the beginning.

A reader of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* who prefers to remain unnamed sent to me a letter from which I quote the following sentences:

On August 26, 1924, the North Atlantic coast was swept by a terrific storm. It was especially violent in

the neighborhood of New Bedford and Buzzard's Bay. An acquaintance of mine who was at her summer home on Buzzard's Bay, at a point where the wind blew off shore, told me that the tide did not come in that day—in fact that the cove which her house overlooks was quite empty of water. I am glad to have this story, which seemed to me almost incredible, corroborated by the instances you cite in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, and to add it to your list in support of Seneca.

Professor E. Adelaide Hahn, of Hunter College, sent me a clipping from *The New York World*, of January 30, 1926. The day before the thermometer in New York City had stood virtually at zero. There had been also a high wind. The last paragraph of the clipping runs as follows:

### *Blows Water From Canal*

The wind blew so much water out of the Hackensack and Passaic Rivers that some of the water canals of the public service plants were almost bared and electric light service was diminished. The water of the Point-No-Point plant on the Passaic dropped to three feet, a foot lower than ever before. The American side of Niagara Falls was reported dry for the second time in history. An ice jam above Goat Island formed a barrier that diverted the flow to the Canadian side.

Dr. McCartney calls my attention also to Strabo 7.4.1 (I give the version of Professor Horace Leonard Jones, in the Loeb Classical Library):

Here is the isthmus which separates what is called Lake Sapra from the sea; it is forty stadia in width and forms what is called the Tauric, or Scythian, Chersonese. Some, however, say that the breadth of the isthmus is three hundred and sixty stadia. But though Lake Sapra is said to be as much as four thousand stadia<sup>1</sup>, it is only a part, the western part, of Lake Maeotis, for it is connected with the latter by a wide mouth. It is very marshy and is scarcely navigable for sewn boats, for the winds readily uncover the shallow places and then cover them with water again, and therefore the marshes are impassable for the larger boats. The gulf contains three small islands, and also some shoals and a few reefs along the coast.

Dr. McCartney directs me also to Dio Cassius 39. 61.1-2 (I give the translation by Earnest Carey, in the Loeb Classical Library):

Meantime the Tiber, either because excessive rains had occurred somewhere up the stream above the city, or because a violent wind from the sea had driven back its outgoing tide, or still more probably, as was surmised, by the act of some divinity, suddenly rose so high as to inundate all the lower levels in the city and to overwhelm many even of the higher portions. These houses, therefore, being constructed of brick, became soaked through and collapsed, while all the animals perished in the flood. And of the people all who did not take refuge in time on the highest points were caught, either in their dwellings, or in the streets, and lost their lives. The remaining houses, too, became weakened, since the mischief lasted for many days, and they caused injuries to many, either at the time or later....

CHARLES KNAPP

<sup>1</sup>Add 'in perimeter', says Professor Jones, in a note.

CICERO, IN CATILINAM 1.15<sup>1</sup>

## ON THE TRANSLATION OF DECLINATIONE ET, UT AIUNT, CORPORE

In speaking of the many attempts of Catiline's conspirators against his life Cicero exclaims (In Catilinam 1.15): Quot ego tuas petitiones ita coniectas ut vitari posse non viderentur, *parva declinatione et, ut aiunt, corpore, effugit*. The words *ut aiunt* clearly show that the expression *declinatione et...corpore* (cf. the words *corporis declinatio*, used by Curtius, as quoted below) has some technical connotation, whether athletic or military. To translate it by a colorless phrase, 'by bending (leaning) the body', and then to add, 'as they say', is to disregard the proprieties and the niceties of translation.

Servius (on Vergil, Aeneid 9.437) quotes this passage in connection with his statement that the word *petitio* is properly used of the thrust of a sword in the hands of a gladiator: *petitiones proprie dicimus impetus gladiatorum*. Since the blows of Catiline were intended to be fatal and since the most accurate and deadly weapon of the Romans was the sword, there is little doubt that Servius is right in looking upon the figure as drawn from sword-play<sup>2</sup>.

That the word *petitio* had, however, a wider application in the palaestra is shown by Cicero himself (Orator 228):

'... For, as we see that athletes in general—it is just about the same with gladiators—do nothing by careful parry and violent thrust <*petendo vehementer*> in which their action does not reveal something sanctioned in the palaestra, so that their every action has a purpose useful for the contest but still graceful to the onlooker, so the orator does not deliver a telling blow unless the thrust <*petitio*> is properly made, and likewise he does not avoid an attack under sufficient cover <*nec satis tecte declinat impetum*> unless he understands also the approved method of withdrawing <*cedendo*>.'

Evidently the word *petitio* could be used of any sort of personal encounter in which blows were exchanged. I take it that *declinare impetum* is another way of saying *corpore effugere petitionem*, and that this expression, or one synonymous with it, might be used whenever an effort was made to avoid a *petitio* by swerving.

I doubt not that the words *corporis declinatio* echo Greek usage. *κλίσις* and its compounds are found frequently in accounts of military and athletic contests. An interesting, if not very significant, example occurs in Zonaras, Annales 9.14. When Hannibal sees Masinissa pursuing him on horseback at breakneck speed, he swerves aside slightly (*ἀρέμα ἐξέκλινε*), and permits his pursuer to rush by. Philopoemen causes his horse to swerve aside (*ἐκέκλινε*) to render more effective

his attack upon Machanidas (Plutarch, Philopoemen 10.7)<sup>3</sup>. In the Iliad (3.360, 7.254) both Paris and Hector swerve (*ἐκλίνθη*) to avoid weapons and thus escape black death. Belisarius was wounded by an arrow which, so Procopius tells us (6. 27.14), he failed to see in time to turn aside (*ἐκτρέπεσθαι*). Curtius uses *capitis (corporis) declinatione vitare* to describe a way of avoiding lances: Prior barbarus emisit hastam, quam Erigyus *modica capitis declinatione* vitavit... <7.4.36>; lanceam emisit, quam Dioxippus cum *exigua corporis declinatione* vitasset... <9.7.21>.

The following passage, likewise from Curtius (4.6. 16), contains a close approximation to Cicero's usage, since a sword is the weapon avoided: At barbarus, gladio strenue in dextram translato, cervicem appetit regis, qui, *exigua corporis declinatione* evitato ictu, in vanum manum barbari lapsam amputat gladio...

In the account of the boxing-match between Polydeuces and Amycus, Apollonius Rhodius (Argonautica 2.92-93) tells how the Greek hero turned his head and 'side-stepped' as his opponent rushed him: δ' ἀλξαντος ὑπέστη, πρῶτα παρακλίνας.

The Roman boxing-master shouted to his charge: Caput ad laevam (Suetonius, De Grammaticis 22). Dares and Entellus were skilled in this movement (Vergil, Aeneid 5.428): adduxere retro longe capita ardua ab ictu. Farther on in the description of this encounter (444-445) Vergil says: Ille < = Dares > ictum venientem a vertice velox praevidit celerique elapsus corpore cessit. The words *celeri elapsus corpore* certainly refer to a *corporis declinatio*. Dares 'side-stepped'. Aside from metrical considerations, *corporis declinatio* is unsuitable for poetry.

*Declinatio* and its Greek cognates, as used by the authors cited, include the ideas of 'ducking', dodging, and side-stepping. I do not believe that there could have been in common use any effective body movement which did not imply or necessitate some use of the feet<sup>4</sup>.

By Cicero's time *corporis declinatio* had evidently become a quite technical expression in the palaestra and in the gladiatorial training schools. For using the expression Cicero apologizes by *quadam* as well as by *ut aiunt*. Unless we can translate by words with a sporting or military association, *ut aiunt* should be omitted in our rendering. The possibilities are limited. Missiles are so swift that they no longer can be ducked. In foil-fencing thrusts are parried, not avoided by

<sup>1</sup>May we not compare with these Greek passages, for the thought [not for the language], Aeneid 11.600-608, the passage in which Vergil describes how Camilla slew Orsilochus and Butes? See especially 604-608, verses which Conington translated thus: "... Orsilochus, as she pretends to fly and wheels round in a mighty ring, she baffles by ever circling inwards [*eludit gyro interior*] and chases him that chases her: at last, rising to the stroke, she brings down on the wretch again and again, spite of all his prayers, her massy battle-axe that rives armour and bone: the brain spouts over the face through the ghastly wound..." As Camilla speeds, in pretended flight, from Orsilochus, she sweeps round at first in great circles; presently she swerves to one side, to the left. This maneuver puts her on an inner and so shorter circle than that on which Orsilochus is moving; as he shoots past her on the outer, longer circle, she gets behind him and turns her pretended flight into a real pursuit. C. K. >

<sup>2</sup>There could be—a body movement backward and forward, front and rear. C. M. K. >

<sup>3</sup>After making such suggestions as I could concerning this paper, suggestions which Dr. McCartney was good enough to consider carefully, and to adopt in large part, I enlisted the cooperation of my son, Dr. Charles M. Knapp, Associate Professor of American History, The University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. Dr. Knapp was not, and is not, wholly innocent of classical training. Besides, he has something which I lack—practical, first-hand knowledge of fencing.

<sup>4</sup>To THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.199-200 Dr. Knapp contributed a review of C. H. St. L. Russell, The Tradition of the Roman Empire. A Sketch of European History. C. K. >

<sup>5</sup>Foil-fencing was of course unknown to the ancients.

<sup>6</sup>The word *tecle* is the reading of the Teubner text (1902) and also of the Oxford text. The older Teubner text has *recte*.



body-shifting<sup>\*</sup>. To-day 'side-stepping' is used in football, basketball, and boxing. If we engaged in sword-play in the Roman manner, we should, I doubt not, employ the word in this connection also.

I suggest, therefore, the word 'side-stepping', since that action is generally accompanied by a body-shifting in addition to that necessitated by moving the legs. Another recommendation of the word 'side-stepping' is that it too is used figuratively.

In correspondence about this paper Professor Knapp asked whether Cicero was clear in his own head about the origin of his figure; he suggested that Cicero was thinking confusedly at once of boxing and of sword-play. If he was not clear, then the equally non-committal word 'side-stepping' is extremely satisfactory as a rendering.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

### COMMENTS ON DR. MCCARTNEY'S PAPER

The Encyclopaedia Britannica is not of much use in connection with our problem. We need pictures and diagrams, or an actual knowledge of fencing play, for an understanding of the passage.

In fencing one learns all the formal rules and formal movements individually, i. e. he learns, one by one, what things ought to be done and how to do each. But no one movement is ever used separately; the movements are always used in combination. Further, no movement of the weapon is ever made without some correlation with position of the body, or movement of the body, if necessary. A very important point to keep in mind is that parries of the weapon are made by the movement of weapon, or by arm and weapon, or by the body alone (withdrawal from the point of the opposing weapon by 'retreating' [withdrawing] the feet and the body backwards, by ducking the whole body—that is, by squatting in the guard position, and allowing the opponent's point to go over the shoulder or over the head entirely). The last mentioned movement is used considerably by experts and professionals. Mr. Murray, our Columbia fencing-master, when he wanted to upset completely his student opponent, used it frequently and most effectively; it is a surprise defense, and the opponent is helplessly exposed to the 'time' thrust. It is used by some continually on the defense, as a crouch. Such a movement is a crouching or ducking of the whole body; the movement is perpendicular, up and down; the feet remain stationary. It is a parry by the body, what may be termed a refusal to find, follow, and parry the opponent's point. It is really in the nature of a trick, obvious to the opponent except when it is used by an expert, but the expert can, with practice, use it most effectively.

<sup>\*</sup>According to the regulations of Elizabethan times, "Thrusts, as a rule, had to be avoided by body movements, by ducking, or by a vault aside (*incarlata*), or beaten away with the left hand, the hand being protected with a gauntlet or armed with a dagger..." (Encyclopaedia Britannica<sup>1</sup>, 10.249, second column, s.v. Fencing). By the end of the seventeenth century the essence of the new French sword-play was "nimbleness of wrist; it required quickness of spirit rather than muscular vigour..." (*ibidem*, 250). See also the article on Foil-Fencing, in the same volume, 591-595.

<sup>1</sup>In foil-fencing thrusts are parried by *body movements*.

C. M. K. >

Ducking the head—that is, moving it very slightly to the side, and also backward, to keep out of reach of a searching point, is part of the game. Obvious and broad dodging is something else. One can parry, also, by moving forward, lunging forward, to meet an attack and stopping it by a simple parry and actual body to body contact—what in boxing is called "falling into a clinch". This, however, is bad form, and not part of the rules (though it is part of the actual practice).

You may infer from the above that I do not like the term "side-step". In all good sword-play, the thrust—extension of the arm and the weapon to full length—is made at the target before there is any need by the defender to seek to parry the thrust. Only when the thrust is continued as the lunge with the movement of feet and body is there need to parry; up to that point it is all feinting, and there is no effective parry that can be used. Only when the lunge (thrust or extension already made) is started is there need for a decisive parry. When the lunge is started and under way, the point can not safely be shifted on the target, that is the aim can not then be safely changed. Side-stepping is then useless, for side-stepping would make useless one's own parry and place one in a helpless position. A perpendicular ducking or crouching or squatting is very helpful because from that position the counter-attack is very easy and effective.

Now side-stepping, or rather circling the opponent, is used when you are attacking him or are seeking to maneuver him into a disadvantageous position, that is into soft footing, against a wall, etc.; it is possible, however, to use it only against a wild opponent and then it is really not necessary. One naturally moves backward in what is termed the orderly "retreat" against such an attack, or he ducks and lets the point go over his head, or to either side of his head, or else he uses this movement in an actual duel when he is forced by a circling movement into a bad position and so is obliged to make a quick jump to another position. I do not like the term "side-step" with respect to sword-play of any kind.

In some respects the term "refusal" is possible in connection with fencing—particularly duelling. The most difficult opponent to meet and attack is the one who refuses to parry a feint of attack. If you can get your opponent to parrying the feint, that is, the thrust, before your real attack or lunge is started, the touching or reaching of the opponent's person in a vulnerable part is likely to follow easily. Here, let me ask, did not Cicero avoid some of Catiline's schemes by declining or refusing to set up defenses against them, i. e. by declining to disclose his defense?

I think the term "side-stepping" not likely to be connected with one on the defense as was Cicero. I think *ducking*, crouching, swerving the body or head, *bending* the body better.

I am inclined to believe that Cicero wanted to say that the thrusts made by Catiline—so well aimed were they—he evaded only with the greatest difficulty, that is by his skill both with weapon and with body, that is by a parry with sword and a swerve or retreat of the body. Perhaps the attack was so vigorous that he was

forced back, and as a last resort parried and ducked. That later he counterattacked we know.

The movement I have in mind is well illustrated by a figure (a photograph) on page 284 of a book entitled *Athletics and Outdoor Sports for Women*, published by The Macmillan Company (1903). The Introduction was written by L. C. Hill. The Article on Fencing was written by Regis Senac. The illustration I mention is not covered in the text, but it shows well the attack avoided by ducking and the successful counter-attack by a simple 'time' thrust upon the entirely unprotected body of the assailant. Look it up. Other recent photographs would show the same things. Probably no professional fencing-master would know what you are trying to do and say; hence he would be unable to describe what you want.

So long as one can maintain one's balance, that is control of body for attack and retreat, indeed for any movement, so as to go from one naturally to another that may be required, he can duck, jump up and down, advance, retreat, in fact do almost anything, provided he does not try to side-step to avoid on defense the attack. Cicero, be it remembered, speaks of defense, not of attack.

Since we do not know the real character of ancient sword-play, I do not believe that one can translate Cicero's language literally. It is better, therefore, to paraphrase instead of trying to translate, what very few are now able to understand, terms in fencing.

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
KENTUCKY

CHARLES MERRIAM KNAPP

## TWO ANCIENT ECLIPSES

There are three passages in Homer which have been taken as descriptions of a total eclipse of the sun—(1) *Iliad* 16.567-568; (2) *Iliad* 17.366-376; (3) *Odyssey* 20.351-357. In the translations of the *Iliad* by Leaf, Lang, and Myers, and of the *Odyssey* by Butcher and Lang, they run as follows:

(1) . . . But Zeus drew baneful night above the strong battle, that round his dear son <Sarpedon> might be the woful toil of war. . . .

(2) Thus strove they as it had been fire, nor wouldst thou have thought there was still sun or moon, for over all the battle where the chiefs stood around the slain son of Menoitios <Patroclus> they were shrouded in darkness, while the other Trojans and well-greaved Achaeans fought at ease in the clear air, and piercing sunlight was spread over them, and on all the earth and hills there was no cloud seen. . . . But they who were in the midst endured affliction of the darkness and the battle. . . .

(3) <The seer Theoclymenus is speaking to the Wooers>: Ah, wretched men, what woe is this ye suffer? Shrouded in night are your heads and your faces and your knees, and kindled is the voice of wailing, and all cheeks are wet with tears, and the walls and the fair spaces between the pillars are sprinkled with blood. And the porch is full, and full is the court, of ghosts that hasten hellwards beneath the gloom, and the sun has perished out of heaven, and an evil mist has overspread the world.

Attention has recently been drawn to the subject by an essay, *Die Sechs Griechischen Dichter-Finsternisse*, by Dr. C. Schoch, of Berlin-Steglitz (published, without date, by himself). He finds reasons in the

Odyssean narrative for believing that it contains a description of an actual eclipse of the sun, which began in Ithaka at 11.45 A. M. on April 16, 1178 B. C. His conclusions have found some acceptance. Thus in the *Observer* (London) of March 14, 1926, it is said that Dr. Schoch "has made out a convincing case", and it is argued that we have in the date of the eclipse confirmation of the traditional date of the fall of Troy, 1184 B. C. I may note here that there are some discrepancies between the figures quoted in the *Observer* and those in the printed paper which Dr. Schoch has kindly sent me. The year is given in the *Observer* as 1177, and the time of day as 11.41 A. M.; but these discrepancies do not affect the argument in the present paper.

Similarly, as reported in the *Athenaeum* (London) of July 26, 1890, Mr. Stockwell, in the *Astronomical Journal*, Nos. 220-221, argued that the passage in *Iliad* 17 referred to an actual eclipse of the sun, and found that the sun did suffer total eclipse on August 28, 1185 B. C., and that "the moon's shadow passed centrally over the Hellespont and the western part of Asia Minor". Like Dr. Schoch he inferred that Homer was describing the eclipse established by calculation.

For the instance in *Iliad* 16 the only reference I can trace is in T. D. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, where it is said (50) that "An eclipse of the sun is found by a German scholar in the darkness which attends the death of Sarpedon. . . , but this is by no means certain". No further particulars are given, and I have failed to discover any.

We must accept the two eclipses calculated by the astronomers, but in considering whether Homer refers to them it is necessary in the first place to decide whether the passages in the two epics do refer to eclipses. To begin with the *Odyssey*, we may note that two points favor the inference. The first is the poet's statement that the sun had perished out of heaven; the other is the fact that on the day in question there fell a feast of the new moon. It is only at new moon, Dr. Schoch informs us, that a total eclipse can occur. The poet does not say it was new moon, but the authorities, as Buchholz in his *Realien*, 1.33, following Welcker, arrive at that conclusion by combining the fact that Apollo, in whose honor this particular feast was held, was known as God of the New Moon with the prophecy to Eumaeus by the disguised Odysseus that Ithaka's king would return to his own 'as the old moon wanes and the new is born'. There appears to be nothing more in Dr. Schoch's statement of the case, but the two reasons given are sufficiently cogent.

It is different with the two scenes in the *Iliad*. Of ten editors of the poem consulted only one, Paley, refers to the possibility of an eclipse. He refers to it only to say that it is unnecessary to think of an eclipse, and an examination of the passages discloses no ground for the idea. In Book 16 there is nothing but the statement that Zeus drew night above the battle. In Book 17 the description is more detailed. But in each case all we have is gloom over a part of the Trojan Plain where

<sup>1</sup>Thomas Day Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age* (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1907).

there is a struggle for the body of a fallen chief. Both passages refer to the same day, and two eclipses of the sun in one day are surely an impossibility. One eclipse must go; if one is to remain, it must be the eclipse fully described in Book 17. But there it is said that, while there was darkness over the spot where the fight for the body took place, the sun shone over the rest of the field. No eclipse, one may assume, ever produced a mere patch of shadow on a small part of the earth's surface. Hence there seems no reason for arguing that Homer is describing more than darkness or a mist or a gloomy atmosphere, the shedding of which by divine agency for purposes of concealment is an expedient resorted to elsewhere in the poems. We do not, for example, think of an eclipse when Athene uses this same means to protect Odysseus, on his way to the palace in Phaeacia, from annoyance by the townsfolk.

Again, in the passage in Iliad 17 there is even uncertainty about the reading of one of the lines. It may be that we should read words which would mean 'the dust of battle', and in fact the word ( $\delta\mu\iota\chi\lambda\eta$ ) used of the mist or darkness is in another part of the Iliad used of the gloom produced by a cloud of dust. There is also, as will be seen from the translation given above, a somewhat disconcerting reference to the moon as well as to the sun.

For the view that the poet means an eclipse in the Odyssey there is, as already stated, something to be said. The view is old enough; its contradiction in some ancient comments that have come down to us shows that there were some who entertained it. Plutarch objected to it in his treatise *De Facie in Orbe Lunae*. In modern editions of the poem there is hardly a reference to it. Merry says it is "not impossible"; eight other editors fail to mention the interpretation. Moreover, there is what appears to be a better explanation. Butcher and Lang, in a note on the passage say,

The omens seen by the second-sighted Theoclymenus . . . are those which everywhere bode death and doom. The shroud of mist covering not only the feet and knees, the sign of approaching but distant death, but reaching to the head so as to foreshow that death is even at the doors is familiar to readers of Martin's book on the Western Isles of Scotland. . . .

Parallels are quoted by them from the Story of Burnt Njal, and from the Finnish epic. As regards the disappearance of the sun, we do not, outside the seer's solemn warning, read of any darkness over the island. The words "the world" in the rendering of Butcher and Lang are in fact surplusage; they do not appear in the Greek. The mention of the ghosts that hasten hellwards suggests at once the realm of Hades. So Pierron, quoting ancient authorities, in his note on the passage, says:

Theoclymène voit les âmes des prétendants non plus dans le vestibule, ni dans la cour, ni sur la route de l'Érèbe, mais dans l'Érèbe même, dans la région sans soleil, au sein des éternelles ténèbres.

Monro's note is to the same effect: "the darkness or 'night' is that of death". We have to deal with omens

and nothing more. They begin before the seer speaks, for the poet tells us that the Wooers were eating blood-besprinkled flesh.

If an eclipse had been meant, there would be this difficulty in identifying it with the eclipse of April, 1178 B. C., that the season of the action in this part of the Odyssey has been shown by Professor John A. Scott, in *Classical Philology*, 11.148-155, to be autumn. I gather from Dr. Schoch's paper that he himself admits this difficulty, for he says the season is winter, though it is hard to see how that can be deduced from the one line of the poem on which he relies (Odyssey 18.366). The time of day, just before noon, certainly accords with the narrative of Book 20 up to the point at which the seer intervenes, but that does not take us far. The writer in the Observer puts the killing of the Wooers at 6-8.30 P. M., but that is hard to reconcile with the course of the Homeric story.

If, then, eclipses are not meant in the passages in question, the identification with the two eclipses discovered by the astronomers seems to be impossible. But there is more to be said. The first of the two known eclipses occurred, as already stated, in 1185 B. C., the year before the capture of Troy (dated by tradition in 1184), and it is in the year before the capture of Troy that the fight took place that is described in Iliad 17. The coincidence is remarkable, and it is only a little less remarkable in the Odyssean instance. Odysseus returned to Ithaca in the tenth year after the fall of Troy, that is in 1174, while an eclipse, visible in Ithaca, took place a few years earlier, in 1178 or 1177. So that we have an eclipse just before Troy was taken, and an eclipse a few years before the slaughter of the Wooers, and a passage in each poem describing a darkness in Troyland and in Ithaca at periods of the action of the two poems in very close correspondence with the dates of the two eclipses.

It is hard to believe that all this is nothing more than mere coincidence. The poet, if the view advanced above be correct, cannot be taken to be *describing* eclipses, but may he not have had something of the kind in mind? Homer is, to some authorities, sub-Mycenaean, that is to say his epics date from the eleventh century B. C. Eclipses of the sun are not common events; total eclipses are still rarer. When they do occur, they are ominous to primitive peoples all over the world. The memory of two such in the end of the twelfth century would be long preserved, and, if we believe in the reality of the Trojan War and its after-effects in Greece, would be connected in the popular mind with these disturbing events. The recorder of the great War, or at least of the fighting on the Plain, and of the Great Wandering of the Ithacan king, may well have heard of them, and may well have embellished his narratives by allusion to these darknesses which had been transmitted to his time *per ora virum*. He would not know what an eclipse really meant; he would only know from hearsay that a strange and unnatural darkness occurred on two occasions within the cycle of events which he was making immortal in his verse, and he might well introduce the phenomena into his poems without pretending to anything like accuracy



of description. The discrepancy between the years 1174 and 1178 is of no moment. A poet may take liberties with time and place. His privilege *quidlibet audendi* is not to be questioned.

The belief which was dear to Gladstone, that the poems are in a sense and in a measure good history, has grown steadily stronger of recent years. The Trojan War is now accepted as fact, and the cause of the conflict of interests between the Achaeans and the lords of the stronghold on the Hellespont is understood to have been in its essence economic, though some, as the late Dr. Leaf, are prepared to go further and to accept the immediate cause as that alleged by tradition, the rape of an Achaean princess. On this point the Hittite tablets may yet provide information even more pointedly useful than what has already been gleaned from them. But more than that; the year assigned in ancient times for the fall of Troy is approved as at least an approximately accurate dating. Reference may be made to a remarkable paper by Messrs. J. L. Myers and K. T. Frost in *Klio* 14 (1915), on The Historical Background of the Trojan War. Their conclusion, based on "four sources of evidence: Egyptian documentary history, Greek genealogical folk-memory, Minoan archaeology, and such unassigned episodes as we may be able to bring into a place in a confirmatory way", is that the date is a historical date, and some may be disposed to think that the two eclipses help in a small degree to confirm that belief.

ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND

A. SHEWAN

### REVIEWS

The Culture of Ancient Greece and Rome: A General Sketch. By F. Poland, E. Reisinger, and R. Wagner. Authorized Translation from the Second German Edition (1924), by John Henry Freese. With About a Hundred and Forty Half-tone Illustrations, Maps, and Plans. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company (1926). Pp. 335.

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 20.213 Professor La Rue Van Hook gave a brief account of a book called *Die Antike Kultur in ihrer Hauptzügen Dargestellt*, by Franz Poland, Ernst Reisinger, and Richard Wagner (Leipzig, Teubner, 1924. Pp. 270).

The work was brought out in 1926, in an English version, under the title given above in the caption of this notice.

The translator, Mr. Freese, has had considerable experience in such work. Of the original he writes thus in his brief Prefatory Note:

"... While it contains a large amount of information in clear and concise form, the sections on Greek Literature, Religion, Private Life, Art and Architecture will perhaps be found the most interesting, while the numerous illustrations should prove an agreeable aid to the understanding of the text. Notice has also been taken of the latest discoveries (Priene, papyri, Sappho, Sophocles), and the whole may fairly be considered up to date."

Mr. Freese has added an Appendix, Architectural and Other Terms (311-316), and a Bibliography (317-319). There is also an Index (321-334). The Bibliography includes only works in English.

"... The larger, probably less accessible works have been purposely omitted. Publishers' names are not given in the cases of books out of print".

This Bibliography has very grave defects. For example, there is nothing, apart from dates of publication, to show what edition of a work Mr. Freese had in mind. Nor is the number of volumes in a given work always given. Under the head of Literature only five works are cited. One of these is C. T. Cruttwell, *A History of Roman Literature to the Death of Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1877). Mr. Freese had done better to name, as a complete history of Latin literature to 500 A. D., Marcus Southwell Dimsdale, *A History of Latin Literature* (published in this country by D. Appleton and Company, 1915). For Greek literature only A. Croiset and M. Croiset, *Abridged History of Greek Literature*, as translated by G. F. Heffellbower (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1904), and Gilbert Murray, *Ancient Greek Literature*, are mentioned. Mr. Heffellbower's translation was sharply criticized by the reviewers. A better book than Professor Murray's is *A Short History of Greek Literature from Homer to Julian*, by Professor (Mrs.) Wilmer Cave Wright (New York, American Book Company, 1907). For Roman Art and Topography only three books are given. Professor Platner's work, *The Monuments and Topography of Ancient Rome* (Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1911) is not one of the three. Under Religion we get two such curious bed-fellows as H. A. Guerber, *The Myths of Greece and Rome* (New York, American Book Company, 1907), and J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1908), a distinctly unreliable book. It will be seen, then, that the Bibliography is worse than useless. It is a grievous pity that such worthless material is offered in a book which was meant to have a 'popular' appeal.

CHARLES KNAPP

The Forum and the Palatine. By Christian Huelsen. Translated by Helen H. Tanzer, from the First German Edition, with Numerous Additions and Revisions by the Author. New York: A. Bruderhausen (1928). Pp. xii + 100. With 30 Illustrations in the Text, 1 Folding Plan, and 65 plates. \$3.50.

Among authorities on Roman topography Professor Christian Huelsen has long occupied a prominent place, and it is, therefore, a valuable achievement that makes his writings freely available to English readers. This was seen when an earlier work of his, *The Roman Forum*, in the translation of Jesse Benedict Carter, ran into a second edition (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 1.20-21).

The Forum and the Palatine, the book under review, is a translation of *Forum und Palatin* (München: Drei Masken Verlag A. G., 1926). The translator, Professor Helen H. Tanzer, will be remembered as the author of *The Villas of Pliny the Younger* (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19.161-163).

The contents of *The Forum and the Palatine* are as follows: List of Illustrations (ix-xii); The Forum Before Imperial Times (1-12); The Forum in Imperial Times (13-52); Burial and Excavation of the Forum (53-58); The Palatine Before Imperial Times (59-65); The Imperial Palaces on the Palatine (66-76); Destruction and Excavation of the Imperial Palaces (77-80); Sources and Recent Literature (81-96); Index (97-99).

Strictly avoiding controversial discussions and hypotheses that might require much substantiation, Professor Huelsen has presented a clear description of the ancient remains of the Forum and the Palatine, and has given us some idea of others that once existed. The treatment is concise, definite, and non-technical. Similarly, the style is simple and restrained; there is little superfluity. As an introduction to the topography of Forum and Palatine the book will be an in-



valuable aid, especially for those who may wish to go over the ground some time under the guidance of a master, though the size of the volume may make it a cumbersome *viaticum* for some (the American edition, like the German, measures 9½ x 7 inches).

The illustrations are a distinct asset. They are identical with those used in the German edition. With the text are found 30 plans and line sketches and in the back of the book 65 half-tone plates. Many of them are copies of photographs by Anderson, Alinari, or Vasari; some are reproductions of earlier photographs or drawings. Plate 36 A, for example, represents a pen-and-ink drawing of the Forum, made by Martin van Heemskerck in 1535. These illustrations have been seen before; but for their use here they have been well chosen and excellently printed, and they are constantly referred to in the course of the text and in the Index. Preceding the Plates there is a large Folding Plan of the Forum and the Palatine. Its usefulness would be increased by the presence of an indication of the points of the compass.

In her Preface (v) Miss Tanzer states that her edition is more than merely a translation, in that it contains emendations and additions made by Professor Huelsen himself, who "read the translation through twice, . . . making extensive changes and numerous suggestions, both verbal and topographical. . . ." On pages 22-23, for example, the width of the Augustan Rostra is given as 24 meters (in the German edition it is given as 29.5 meters). There are a few other parenthetical additions. But the greatest supplement to the translated edition lies in the sixteen pages devoted to Sources and Recent Literature (81-96), where, under about ninety different headings (names of sites or objects) are listed numerous references to the works of ancient authors and of modern investigators. Bracketed with each heading is the number of the page where the particular topic is treated in the text. This bibliographical section will largely offset any objections that might be raised because of the absence of footnotes.

Miss Tanzer's translation is, in general, sound and adequate. She has faithfully reproduced the German, though there are times when a too close adherence to the original seems to have betrayed her into expressions that are not in keeping with the best English idiom. Occasionally, in a more detailed passage (as e. g. in the description of the Temple of Vesta, 45) we find that recourse to the German is a help. There are very few actual errors. On page 11 we read: "... He <Caesar> transferred the popular assembly from the Forum, which was in turn growing too small for it, out to the Campus Martius. . . ." The expression "popular assembly" appears as a plural in the German ("die Volksversammlungen"). Both expressions, however, are unsatisfactorily vague. One must assume that by them is meant the Comitia Tributa; and even then it should be noted that there are reasons for believing that this particular "popular assembly", even after Caesar's time, still met occasionally in the Forum (see Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 3.383). In the middle of page 18 'the arch of Tiberius' should be read for "the arch of Augustus" (which is correctly named in the German edition). In speaking (32) of the Basilica Aemilia as "the oldest of the original basilicas in the Forum. . .", 'actual' or 'existing' would seem to be a better rendering than "original" for the German "eigentlich", inasmuch as it had already been stated (11) that the non-existent Basilica Porcia was the oldest of the original basilicas.

One or two errors Miss Tanzer's edition shares with the German original. On page 14 there is mention of "the spot where the body of the Dictator <Caesar> was burned on March 15, 44 B. C. . . ." Evidently the burning of the body has been confused, as to time, with the assassination. On page 25 there is a faulty description of the historical relief on the side of the

eastern screen of the Trajanic *plutei* (or *anaglypha*) which stand not far from the Augustan Rostra and are thought to have been at one time part of its balustrade. We read:

"On the balustrade which is incomplete (the last block on the right is wanting), we see at the extreme right (plate 15, 1) a hexastyle Ionic temple, to the left of it a hexastyle Corinthian temple, and between the two, at the level of the entablatures, an arch. The first temple is that of Saturn, the second Vespasian's and the arch a suggestion of the façade of the Tabularium. On the block at the right, now lost, the temple of Concord must have been shown, and the portico to the left of the temple of Saturn indicates the Basilica Julia. We have therefore on this relief a representation of the west and south sides of the Forum."

Now, in turning one's glance from north to south (i. e. right to left) across the west side of the Forum one sees, in order, the Temple of Concord, the (Corinthian) Temple of Vespasian, the (Ionic) Temple of Saturn, and the Basilica Julia. Moreover, in the Trajan relief in question, it is a hexastyle *Corinthian* temple that appears on the extreme right of the extant portion and a hexastyle *Ionic* temple that appears to the left of it. We must assume, therefore, that in the above quotation a bit of confusion has unconsciously intruded itself and that the positions of the Temple of Saturn and the Temple of Vespasian should be reversed. While there has been considerable disagreement among scholars over the identification of the buildings pictured on these reliefs, all, so far as I know, agree in identifying the Temple of Vespasian and the Temple of Saturn as I have done (see A. S. Jenkins in *The American Journal of Archaeology* 5 1901, 58-92; Christian Huelsen, *The Roman Forum*, translated by J. B. Carter<sup>2</sup>, 103-104).

These comparatively minor flaws do not detract seriously from the worth of a book that so admirably condenses the results of long study and expert knowledge and brings them within reach of even the lay-reader. Miss Tanzer is to be thanked for having done so much to widen the circle of its readers.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.

Latin Epigraphy. An Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions. By Sir John Edwin Sandys. Second Edition, Revised by S. G. Campbell. With Fifty Illustrations. Cambridge: at the University Press (1927). Pp. xxiv + 324.

The first edition of Sir John Edwin Sandys's book, *Latin Epigraphy, An Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions*, I reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 13.212-214 (May 17, 1920).

In his Note to the Second Edition, inserted at the bottom of page xiii, after Sir John Edwin Sandys's original Preface (vii-xiii), Mr. Campbell states that in "the revised edition the scope and plan of . . . book have not been altered. . . ." He continues thus: "... A number of passages have been re-written and many minor corrections in the text and notes have been made. . . . The brief bibliography has been brought up to date by the addition of some of the more important recent works, and references to the periodical literature since 1918 have been introduced, though somewhat sparingly, into the notes. . . ."

When one comes to examine the "revised edition", he notices, at once, that the contents of the two editions are exactly the same throughout, page for page. It is evident, therefore, that the changes must be, in fact, inconsiderable. Certainly the "references to the periodical literature since 1918" have been introduced not merely "somewhat sparingly", but in distinctly miserly fashion. Only a microscopic comparison of the two books, line by line, would show what changes have been made.

I will discuss in detail just three matters.

The bibliographical material on the famous Forum Inscription, the inscription that was found beneath the Lapis Niger, differs in the new edition (38, bottom) from that given in the first edition only by the substitution of "C. I. L. i<sup>2</sup> p. 367" for "Egbert, p. 476, ed. 1908". The last date given in this bibliographical material is 1905!

The account of the Columna Rostrata is exactly the same in the two editions. In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13.213 I called attention to the fact that Sir John Edwin Sandys had made no reference to the discussion of this famous inscription by Professor Tenney Frank, in Classical Philology 14.74-82 (January, 1919). In the new edition note 3 to page 95 has been slightly revised, by the addition of a reference to "C. I. L. i<sup>2</sup> pp. 384-6" and by a reference to "Tenny Frank, Class. Phil. 1919, pp. 74 ff..." It will be seen, first, that Professor Frank's Christian name is misspelled, secondly, that neither the compass nor the nature of Professor Frank's article can be determined from such a stepmotherly reference.

Every student of the Monumentum Ancyranum wishes to know all he can about the fragments of another copy of this important document, recently discovered (1914, 1924), at Antioch, in Pisidia. On page 260 of the "revised edition" one finds the following paragraph:

"In June, 1914, a number of very small fragments of the original Latin text was discovered by Sir W. M. Ramsay at Antioch in Pisidia. This new evidence is quoted in the notes to §§ 8, 10, 22 as 'ANT.' For my first knowledge of this discovery I am indebted to Dr. J. S. Reid and, for all details, to Sir W. M. Ramsay, whose article forms part of the *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. vi, 1919".

This corresponds exactly to the paragraph on the same page of the first edition, except that the first edition, at the end, shows 1918, the "revised edition" shows 1919.

Mr. Campbell's Note to the Second Edition is dated at "Cambridge, 1926" (a rather loose designation of time). The title-page of the "revised edition" bears the date 1927. Why did Mr. Campbell know nothing more about the Monumentum Antiochenum? If he knew more, why did he withhold the information from the readers of this "revised edition"?

The fragments of the Monumentum Antiochenum discovered in 1924 far outweigh in importance those found in 1914. Sir William Ramsay would have been quite willing to give Mr. Campbell information concerning them. Mr. Campbell could have learned much about both sets of fragments from the article by Professor D. M. Robinson, entitled *The Res Gestae Divi Augusti as Recorded on the Monumentum Ancyranum*, in *The American Journal of Philology* 47 (1926), 1-54. Imperfect as that account inevitably was, as an *editio princeps*, prepared and published with too little expenditure of time, none the less the letterpress of the article and the Plates will always, of necessity, be consulted by every earnest student of the Monumentum Antiochenum and the Monumentum Ancyranum.

How could a countryman of Sir William Ramsay have been ignorant of the monograph entitled *Monumentum Antiochenum: Die Neugefundene Aufzeichnung Der Res Gestae Divi Augusti im Pisidischen Antiochia*, Herausgegeben und Erläutert von William Mitchell Ramsay und Anton von Premerstein, which appeared as *Klio*, Beiheft XIX (Neue Folge, Heft VI), and as a separate pamphlet (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1927. Pp. X + 121. Mit 15 Tafeln)! Of course a man who finished his Preface at some time or other in

"1926" could not take account of a book published in 1927, but, I ask, how could a live editor have been unaware of matters so much in the air as the new discoveries of Sir William Ramsay and his American associates in 1924? How could he have failed to know that the work by Messrs. Ramsay and von Premerstein was in preparation?

I may add that in *Klio* XIX (1925), 189-213, there was an article on the Monumentum Antiochenum, by Ehrenberg (unfortunately, as I insert this reference in the proofs, I am unable to ascertain the author's first name or names).

To sum up, this so-called "revised edition" is a sore disappointment, a work unworthy alike of the author and of the Cambridge University Press. Sir Edwin Sandys's book is exactly the sort of book that needs to be revised, really revised, often, to keep it abreast of discoveries and theories. The scholar who has the real scholar's passion to own, come what come may, for himself the important books will want to buy the editions of such a work as they come out. One who buys this "revised edition" will, to put the matter mildly, be far from feeling satisfied that he has got the worth of his money. It would have been far better to leave the original work unaltered till a real revision, by a competent hand, could have been made. Such a real revision would call for the discarding of the old plates of the letterpress, *in toto*, and for the making of the book *de novo*.

CHARLES KNAPP

#### EARLY ILLINOIS SCHOOL TEACHERS AND THEIR FEES<sup>1</sup>

Professor Knapp's paper, *Some Illustrations of Roman Life*, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19.159-161 (March 29, 1926), suggests the following additional parallels from the history of the county in which Jacksonville lies. The parallels bear on the matter of fees of teachers (see page 160).

The first School in Jacksonville was taught by a young Kentucky lawyer, William Thomas. In 1826 he opened the School in a log cabin, on the "subscription plan", taking his fees in cash or in produce. He opened the School at seven in the morning, and taught ten or twelve hours a day. The number of pupils varied from thirty to fifty. He does not state the amount of the fee<sup>2</sup>, but the three months' School period paid his board, postage, and one or two minor matters for a year. His board for that year (including washing, food and lights) cost him one dollar a week.

In 1833 Stephen Douglas arrived in Winchester, with thirty-seven cents in his pocket. He opened a School. He charged three dollars a quarter for each pupil, and secured thirty scholars.

*More Romano*, in those days, there were no Public Schools of any sort, no schoolboards, no regular School buildings. There were no requirements in education to be met, and each teacher set up his School in such vacant room as he might find, and made his own arrangements as to fees, etc., with the parents of the children. A higher fee might be asked for the more advanced classes, and the teacher was expected to make reductions for several children from one family.

ILLINOIS WOMAN'S COLLEGE,  
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON

<sup>1</sup>This interesting note ought to have been published long ago. The blame for the delay is mine. The recent publication of Professor's Mohler's paper, *A Roman Answer to the Salary Question*, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 21.105-107, makes the note timely no w.

<sup>2</sup>I am informed by a local authority that Mr. Thomas's fee was one dollar per pupil.